DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 117 606 CG 010 311

AUTHOR Dowdle, Michael D.; Baker, Elaine
TITLE Perceiving the Good Samaritan: Effects of the Behavior of Others on Attributions of Altruism.
PUB DATE 3 May 75
NOTE 32p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwestern Psychological Association (46th, Chicago, Illinois, May 2-4, 1975)
AVAILABLE FROM Michael D. Dowdle, Department of Psychology, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan 48824

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS *Altruism; *Behavior Patterns; Laboratory Experiments; *Psychological Patterns; Psychological Studies; *Reactive Behavior; Research Projects; Social Attitudes; *Social Influences

ABSTRACT

Subjects judged the behavior of a target person who had helped or not helped a person in distress while the target person was either alone or with confederates who also had helped or not helped. In addition, subjects were told that either (1) 80 percent of all persons tested had helped, (2) 20 percent had helped, or (3) nothing about the percentage that helped. The data revealed that subjects' judgements were a function of the social desirability of the observed behavior when the target person had participated in the altruism situation alone. However, when the target person had participated with confederates persent, subjects' judgments were a function of the similarity/dissimilarity between the target person's behavior and the confederates' behavior rather than the social desirability of the behavior per se. Providing subjects with information about base rates of altruistic behavior had only minimal effects on their judgments. (Author)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED117606

Perceiving the Good Samaritan: Effects of the Behavior of Others on Attributions of Altruism

Michael D. Dowdle
Michigan State University

Elaine Baker
Marshall University

The authors wish to acknowledge the assistance of Frank Bergendahl, Deborah Burnett, Bruce Clay, Ronald Clegg, Nancy Gile, Karen Hannah, James Hawk, Susan Holbrook, Norman Hunter, Thom Keith, Michael Maher, Debra Shannon, Julie Triplett, and Gwen Ward for serving as confederates and experimenters. Appreciation is also extended to Donald Chezik and Herchel Chait for their assistance in the preparation of the stimulus materials and the data analysis, respectively.

A brief version of this research was presented at the Midwestern Psychological Association Convention, Chicago, Illinois, May 3, 1975.

Requests for reprints should be sent to Michael D. Dowdle, Department of Psychology, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, 48824.

CG 010 316

Running Head: Perceiving the Good Samaritan

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Perceiving the Good Samaritan: Effects of the Behavior of Others on Attributions of Altruism

This research investigated attributions of causality inferred from an actor's behavior in an altruism experiment. A typical paradigm for altruism experiments involves presenting a subject, who is either participating alone or with a group of passive confederates, with the option of helping or not helping a person in distress (see Berkowitz, 1972; Krebs, 1970; Latané & Darley, 1970; Macauley & Berkowitz, 1970; Staub, 1974 for reviews). According to attribution theory, whether an actor's behavior in such a setting is perceived as being personally or situationally caused should be a function of both the social consequences of the actor's behavior (Jones & Davis, 1965) as well as the behavior of other persons (Kelley, 1967, 1972).

Jones and Davis' (1965) "acts to disposition" model predicts that behaviors which result in socially undesireable consequences lead to the assignment of a personal locus of causality. The rationale underlying this assumption is that most people act in socially desireable ways most of the time and, therefore, undesireable behavior provides a great deal of information about an individual's personal characteristics. Using a somewhat different approach, Kelley's (1967, 1972) "analysis of variance" model predicts that any behavior which is different from that of other persons in the same situation leads to the

assignment of a personal locus of causality. The rationale underlying this assumption is that whenever a person's behavior is different from that of others in the same situation, there can be no common factor inherent in that situation which could have initiated the behavior.

Both the Jones and Davis and the Kelley formulations make identical predictions regarding the locus of causality attributed to the behavior of a subject who participates in an altruism experiment alone. For example, the behavior of a subject who goes to the aid of a person in distress should not be assigned a personal locus of causality because such behavior has both a socially desireable consequence and because perceivers probably assume that most subjects would go to aid the person. Conversely, the behavior of a subject who did not help the person should be assigned a personal locus of causality because it has both socially undesireable consequences and it is different from what perceivers would expect most subjects to do.

However, in those conditions in which a subject participates in the altruism experiment along with passive confederates, the two formulations of attribution theory make opposite predictions. For example, the behavior of a subject who does not help the person in distress while participating with the passive confederates should be assigned a personal locus of causality according to the Jones and Davis formulation because the observed behavior is low in social desireability. But according to Kelley's formulation, this behavior should not be assigned a personal locus of causality because the subject's behavior is identical to that

of other persons in the same situation. These two formulations make the reverse predictions regarding the assignment of a personal versus a situational locus of causality for the behavior of a subject who goes to aid the person in distress while the confederates sit passively. That is, the Jones and Davis formulation predicts that such altruistic behavior should not be attributed a personal locus of causality because of its high social desireability whereas the Kelley formulation predicts that it should be assigned a personal locus because the behavior is different from that of the other persons in the same setting. Even if one were to add an additional experimental condition to the traditional altruism paradigm in which the confederates went to the aid of the person instead of remaining passive, these divergent predictions from the two formulations would remain.

Therefore, the present research was conducted to examine the pattern of causal attributions about a target person who had participated in a typical altruism experiment. Subjects were asked to attribute causality to the behavior of a target person who had either helped or not helped a person in distress. In addition, the context in which this behavior occurred was varied such that the target person (male and female) was either alone or with confederates who helped or didn't help.

One additional variable was included which dealt with information given subjects about overall rates of altruistic behavior. Subjects were told that either (a) 80% of all persons participating in a particular experimental condition helped the person in distress, (b) that

20% of all persons in the particular condition helped, or (c) were given no information regarding rates of helping behavior. It was expected that this information regarding base rates of altruism would act as an anchor for subjects to use when attributing causality to the target person's behavior.

Method

Subjects

Subjects were introductory psychology students who participated in the experiment as a partial course requirement. Subjects participated in groups with an approximately equal number of males and females in each experimental condition.

Design

The study involved a 2 x 2 x 3 x 3 completely randomized factorial design. The independent variables were the sex of the target person (male, female), the target person's behavior (helped, did not help), the experimental condition of the target person in the altruism study (alone, with others who helped, or with others who did not help), and the base rate information subjects received regarding altruistic behavior (no information, 20% helped, or 80% helped). Ten subjects participated in each of the 36 experimental conditions.

Materials

Series of slides were made depicting the conditions of an altruism study similar to that of Latané and Rodin (1969). The first slide in a series showed the target person (and four experimental confederates)[1]

entering the laboratory and being greeted by an attractive female experimenter. The second slide showed the experimenter handing out a questionnaire that the target person (and confederates) were ostensibly to complete and the third slide showed the experimenter leaving the room as the target person (and confederates) worked on the questionnaire. The fourth slide depicted the target person (and confederates) initially hearing the experimenter's plea for help after she had supposedly fallen off a chair and injured her ankle. The remaining slide(s) in the series showed the target person (and/or confederates) either going to aid the experimenter or not going to her aid. The particular series of slides shown was determined by the experimental condition.

Procedure

Subjects were told that the purpose of the present experiment was to evaluate the behavior of a target person who had participated in an altruism study. They were led to believe that the experimenter had previously conducted the altruism experiment although the slides that they were to observe were only a recreation of that study.

For half the subjects, the target person in the slides was a female who either helped or did not help the person in distress, and for the other subjects the target person was a male who either helped or did not help. Further, the target person participating in the altruism study was either alone, with a group of four confederates who did not go to the aid of the person in distress, or with a group of four confederates who went to the aid of the person. In those conditions in

which the confederates were present, they were the same sex as the target person.

During the presentation of the slides, the experimenter read a description of the experimental condition of an altruism study that corresponded to the particular series of slides. For those conditions in which confederates were present, the experimenter pointed out to the subjects the individual who was the target person and the individuals who were the confederates. The same individual (male or female) was always the target person regardless of the experimental condition. It was also during this description that the experimenter stated several times that either 80% of all persons tested had helped the person in distress, that 20% of all persons tested had helped, or said nothing about what percent of all persons had helped.

Dependent Measures

Following the presentation of the series of slides, subjects were given booklets containing a number of items which they were to use in evaluating the behavior of the target person. The dependent measures involved the subject's attributions of causality of the target person's behavior, their estimates of the generality of that behavior, and their evaluative impressions of the target person's personality.

Attribution of causality was measured by asking subjects to indicate the percentage of situational causation and the percentage of personal causation for the target person's behavior. This item was presented such that the total causation attributed would equal 100 percent.

Estimates of the generality of the target person's behavior were measured by asking subjects to indicate on a ten point scale the extent to which the target person's behavior could be related to real life situations. Evaluative impressions of the target person were measured by having the subjects rate the person on nine pairs of bipolar adjectives.[2] Subjects were instructed to circle the number on a ten point scale which best indicated their impressions of the target person. The booklet also contained one additional item which dealt with subjects' estimates of the percentage of all people who would have helped the person in distress under similar circumstances. This latter item was used both as a manipulation check to see if subjects were responding to the information they had received regarding base rates of altruistic behavior and as a measure of the effect of the independent variables on subjects' own estimates of base rates for altruistic behavior.

Results

Attributions of Causality

The mean percentages of personal causality attributed to the target person are presented in Table 1 and the ANOVA summary for this data is presented in the first column of Table 4. As would be expected, the altruism condition had a significant effect on subjects' attributions of causality ($F = 9.48$, $df = 2/324$, $p < .001$). When the target person was participating in the altruism study alone, subjects assigned a higher percentage of personal causality to the behavior ($M = 56.99\%$)

than when the target person was with a group of confederates that did not help (M = 47.20%) or with a group of confederates that helped (M = 45.74%).

Insert Tables 1 and 4 about here

The analysis of subjects' attributions of causality also revealed a significant interaction as a function of the altruism condition and the target person's behavior (F = 23.64, df = 2/324, $p < .001$). When the target person participated in the altruism study alone, subjects' attributions of causality varied according to the target person's behavior. That is, a higher percentage of personal causality was attributed to the target person who was alone when he/she did not help the person in distress (M = 64.40%) than when he/she helped (M = 49.58%). However, when the target person participated with a group of confederates, subjects' attributions of causality varied as a function of the similarity/dissimilarity between the target person's behavior and the confederates' behavior. When the confederates did not help, more personal causality was attributed to the target person's behavior when he/she helped (M = 57.32%) than when he/she did not help (M = 37.08%). But when the confederates helped, more personal causality was attributed to the target person's behavior when he/she did not help (M = 51.43%) than when he/she helped (M = 40.05%). In other words, more personal causality was attributed to the target person's behavior whenever that behavior was the opposite of the behavior of the confederates.

The information subjects had been given regarding base rates for altruistic behavior influenced their attributions of causality as evidenced by the significant three-way interaction involving the altruism condition, the target person's behavior, and the base rate information (F = 2.64, df = 4/324, $p < .05$). Although an identical ordering of means was obtained for each information condition when averaged across the sex variable, the altruism condition and the target person's behavior had less of an effect on subjects' attributions of causality when they had been told that 80% of all persons had helped than when given no information or told that 20% helped.

Estimates of Generality

The means for subjects' estimates of the extent to which they thought the target person's behavior could be generalized to a real life situation are presented in Table 2 and the ANOVA summary is presented in the second column of Table 4. Whether the target person helped or did not help the person in distress had a significant effect on subjects' estimates of the generality of the behavior (F = 20.96, df = 1/324, $p < .001$). The socially undesireable act of not helping was rated as more generalizable to real life situations (M = 3.04) than the socially desireable act of helping (M = 4.28).

Insert Table 2 about here

The effect of helping or not helping the person in distress was also influenced by the behavior of the confederates as shown by the

significant interaction of the altruism condition with the target person's behavior ($F = 3.99$, $df = 2/324$, $p < .05$). However, the nature of this interaction for subjects' estimates of the generality of the behavior did not follow exactly the same pattern as the interaction of these variables for subjects' attributions of causality. Although not helping was estimated as more generalizable ($M = 2.65$) than helping ($M = 4.67$) when the target person participated alone, estimates of generality when confederates were present with the target person did not consistently vary as a function of the similarity/dissimilarity between the target person's behavior and the confederates' behavior. Behavior by the target person which was opposite that of the confederates' resulted in higher estimates of generality only in the altruism condition in which the confederates helped the person in distress. That is, when the confederates helped, the behavior of the target person who did not help was rated as more generalizable to real life situations ($M = 3.13$) than the behavior of the target person who helped ($M = 4.63$). But when the confederates did not help, there were essentially no differences in the estimates of generality for the target person who helped ($M = 3.55$) and for the target person who did not help ($M = 3.35$).

An inspection of the means in Table 2 shows that this relationship between the altruism condition and the target person's behavior was influenced to some extent by the information subjects were given regarding base rates of altruistic behavior. Subjects told that 80% of

all persons tested had helped judged the target person's behavior as being more generalizable whenever it was the opposite of the behavior of the confederates, whereas subjects told that 20% had helped or given no information always judged not helping as more generalizable than helping. This relationship was reflected by the marginally significant interaction involving base rate information and the target person's behavior ($F = 2.52$, $df = 2/324$, $p < .10$).

Base Rate Estimates of Altruism

The means and ANOVA summary for subjects' estimates of the percentage of all persons who would have helped under similar circumstances presented in Table 3 and the third column of Table 4, respectively. As shown in the tables, the behavior of the target person had a significant effect on subjects' estimates of the percentage of all people who would have helped ($F = 26.67$, $df = 1/324$, $p < .001$). This data is identical to that obtained for the estimates of generality in that subjects who had seen a target person go to the aid of the person in distress estimated that a higher percentage of all persons would help ($M = 67.39\%$) than subjects who had seen a target person who did not aid the person ($M = 56.44\%$).

Insert Table 3 about here

The information subjects received regarding rates of altruistic behavior also had a significant effect on their estimates of the percentage of all persons who would help ($F = 82.91$, $df = 2/324$, $p < .001$).

Subjects told that 80% of the persons who participated in the altruism study had helped estimated that a higher percentage of all people would help under similar circumstances (M = 75.92%) than subjects told that only 20% of the persons in the study had helped (M = 43.42%). Subjects given no information regarding rates of altruistic behavior gave intermediate estimates (M = 66.42%).

However, the effect of this base rate information was modified by the altruism condition of the target person. The significant interaction of the base rate information with the altruism condition (F = 4.00, df = 4/324, $p < .05$) was the result of a different ordering of the mean estimates of the percentage of all persons who would help in each of the altruism conditions. Subjects given no information regarding base rates estimated that a higher percentage of all persons would help after observing a target person participate alone (M = 70.25%) or with confederates who did not help (M = 71.25%) than with confederates who helped (M = 57.75%), whereas subjects told that 20% of all persons had helped gave higher estimates after observing a target person with confederates who helped (M = 47.25%) or did not help (M = 46.25%) than a target person participating alone (M = 36.75%). Interestingly, subjects told that 80% of all persons had helped gave almost identical estimates after observing the target person participate alone (M = 78.00%), with confederates who helped (M = 75.00%), and with confederates who did not help (M = 74.00%).

There were also two other interactions obtained involving the base rate information. The first of these is a marginally significant interaction of the base rate information with the target person's behavior ($F = 3.00$, $df = 2/324$, $p < .06$). An inspection of the means presented in Table 3 shows that the effect of helping versus not helping on subjects' estimates of the percent of all persons who would help was greater when subjects were given no information regarding base rates than when told that either 20% or 80% of all persons tested had helped. The second interaction reached the conventional level of significance and involved all four independent variables ($F = 4.00$, $df = 4/324$, $p < .01$). Unfortunately, the nature of this interaction is uninterpretable and shows only that the relationship between base rate information and the other variables is highly complex.

Evaluative Impressions

Summaries of the univariate and multivariate F ratios used to analyze subjects' evaluative impressions of the target person are presented in Table 5. Significant multivariate F ratios were obtained for the altruism condition ($F = 1.92$, $df = 18/632$, $p < .05$), the target person's behavior ($F = 26.09$, $df = 9/316$, $p < .001$) and the interaction of these two variables ($F = 5.42$, $df = 18/632$, $p < .001$). In addition, the sex of the target person resulted in a significant multivariate F ratio ($F = 4.67$, $df = 9/316$, $p < .001$) as did the interaction of the sex of the target person, the altruism condition, and the target person's behavior ($F = 1.81$, $df = 18/632$, $p < .05$).

Insert Table 5 about here

An inspection of the univariate F ratios for this data revealed that the target person who participated in the altruism study with confederates that did not help was rated as significantly more active and stronger than the target person who participated either alone or with confederates that helped. Furthermore, the target person who helped the person in distress, in comparison to the target person who did not help, was judged to be significantly more independent, active, strong, warm, intelligent, and likeable. The female target person was judged to be significantly more likeable and attractive than the male target person.

The univariate F ratios for the significant multivariate interaction of the altruism condition and the target person's behavior revealed that the evaluative impressions were determined by the similarity/dissimilarity between the target person's behavior and the confederates' behavior when the confederates were present, but were primarily determined by the social desireability of the behavior when the target person participated alone. That is, whenever the target person's behavior was opposite that of the confederates who were present, the target person was rated as more independent, nonconforming, and harder to influence than when the target person's behavior was identical to that of the confederates'. Therefore, helping versus not helping per se did not influence the evaluative impressions when the target person participated with confederates. However, when the target person participated alone, the target person who performed the socially undesireable

act of not helping was rated as more dependent and easily influenced than the target person who performed the socially desireable act of helping. The only inconsistent finding regarding this outcome in the data was that the target person who helped when alone was rated just as conforming as the target person who did not help when alone.

The univariate F ratios for the three-way interaction of the altruism condition, the target person's behavior, and the sex of the target person showed that subjects' evaluative impressions were determined by the stimulus conditions to a greater extent for the female target person than the male target person. That is, the previously mentioned interaction of the altruism condition with the target person's behavior for judgments of dependent-independent were more pronounced when the target person was female than when the target person was male. Furthermore, ratings of the females' attractiveness varied according to the social desireability of her behavior when she was alone, but varied according to the similarity/dissimilarity between her behavior and the confederates' behavior in those conditions in which confederates were also present. The ratings of the attractiveness of the male target person showed no differences as a function of either the social desireability of the behavior or the confederates' behavior.

Discussion

The results show that the effect of the social desireability of the observed behavior on attributions of causality depended on whether the target person had participated in the altruism study alone or with

other persons. When the target person had participated alone, judgments of personal causation were a function of the social desireability of the observed behavior, i.e., the socially undesireable act of not helping was judged to be more personally caused than the socially desireable act of helping. But when the target person had participated with other persons, the social desireability of the observed behavior did not directly influence causal attributions. Instead, judgments of personal causality were a function of the similarity/dissimilarity between the target person's behavior and that of the other persons. Behavior by the target person which was different from the behavior of the other persons was judged to be more personally caused than behavior which was identical to that of the other persons.

This finding that the act of not helping a person in distress led to the assignment of increased personal causation when the target person was alone is consistent with both the Jones and Davis (1965) and the Kelley (1967, 1972) formulations of attribution theory. The act of not helping was expected to be more personally caused because of its socially undesireable consequences and it is contrary to what most persons would be expected to do under similar circumstances, respectively. However, when other persons were present in the altruism situation with the target person, the obtained data support the Kelley formulation of attribution theory but do not support the Jones and Davis formulation. In these experimental conditions where the two formulations made opposing predictions, the behavior of the other persons in the setting mediated

subjects' attributions of personal causality but the social desireability of the target person's behavior had no direct effect on their attributions.

This differential support for the two formulations of attribution theory as a function of when other persons were present in the situation was also apparent in the subjects' estimates of the generality of the behavior to a real life situation and their evaluative impressions of the target person. Although not helping was judged as more generalizable to real life situations and was generally rated less favorably than helping, these data also varied according to whether the target person had participated alone or with other persons. Subjects' judgments were a function of the social desireability of the behavior when the target person participated alone, but were a function of the similarity/dissimilarity between the target person's behavior and the behavior of the other persons when the others were present. However, it should be noted that the effect of the presence of others was not as consistent for the estimates of generality as it was for the evaluative impressions and the previously mentioned attributions of causality. The estimates of generality when other persons were present varied only when the others had helped, whereas the evaluative impressions and the attributions of causality varied regardless of whether the others had helped or not helped.

Furthermore, this relationship between the target person's behavior and the behavior of the other persons present in the situation was

generally consistent for both female and male target persons. Subjects' attributions of causality and their estimates of the generality of the behavior did not vary as a function of the sex of the target person although subjects' evaluative impressions did vary to some extent for the male and female target person. The female target person was rated as weaker, more likeable, and more attractive than the male target person which seems to reflect cultural stereotypes. The finding that the evaluative impressions for two of the pairs of bipolar adjectives were determined by the stimulus conditions more for the female than the male target person is consistent with previous research suggesting that females are perceived as being more responsive to situational influences than males (Miller, 1967).

Telling subjects the percentage of all persons who helped the person in distress under similar circumstances had been expected to modify their judgments of the target person. However, the effect of this base rate information was minimal and resulted only in one significant interaction for attributions of causality and one marginally significant interaction for estimates of generality. Both these interactions showed that the relationship between the target person's being alone versus being with others and helping versus not helping was different when subjects were told that 80% of all persons had helped as compared to when they were told that only 20% helped or given no information. Unfortunately, this effect of telling subjects that a large majority of persons act altruistically was inconsistent because this

information tended to increase the relationship between the altruism condition and the target person's behavior for subjects' estimates of generality but tended to decrease the relationship of these variables for attributions of causality.

Although this effect of the different types of base rate information does not correspond with principles derived from attribution theory, it is consistent with previous research which has also found that base rate information has only a slight effect (McArthur, 1972) or no effect on subjects' judgments of target persons (Miller, Gillen, Schenker, & Radlove, 1973; Nisbett & Borgida, 1975). The minimal usage of base rates of altruism in the present research does not appear to be due to a misunderstanding or forgetting of this information because subjects' own estimates of the percentage of the general population who would help accurately reflected the base rate information they had received. Furthermore, the findings that subjects generally did not utilize the base rate information for their judgments of a particular target person even though the target person's actions of helping versus not helping influenced their judgments of altruism by the general population is consistent with research conducted by Nisbett and Borgida (1975). These authors investigated subjects' attributions regarding participants in both an altruism and a Milgram-type obedience experiment and concluded that "subjects' unwillingness to deduce the particular from the general is matched only by their willingness to infer the general from the particular" (p. 19).

Therefore, subjects' judgments of a target person in an altruism situation seem to be based almost entirely on the behavior they observe, while equally relevant information regarding base rates is generally ignored. These findings suggest that subjects' use of information in making judgments about a target person depends on the nature of the information itself. Observation of a target person's behavior as it occurs concurrently with behavior by other individuals influences the attribution process, but being told the degree of similarity/dissimilarity between the target person's behavior and the behavior of others has little effect on the attribution process. At least as far as altruism situations are concerned, it's as if subjects believe what they see, not what they hear.

References

Berkowitz, L. Social norms, feelings, and other factors affecting helping behavior and altruism. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology, Vol. 6. New York: Academic Press, 1972.

Jones, E. E., & Davis, K. E. From acts to dispositions: The attribution process in person perception. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology, Vol. 2. New York: Academic Press, 1965.

Kelley, H. H. Attribution theory in social psychology. In D. Levine (Ed.), Nebraska Symposium on Motivation. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1967, pp. 192-238.

Kelley, H. H. Causal schemata and the attribution process. New York: General Learning Press, 1972.

Krebs, D. L. Altruism--An examination of the concept and a review of the literature. Psychological Bulletin, 1970, 73, 258-302.

Latané, B., & Darley, J. M. The unresponsive bystander: Why doesn't he help? New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1970.

Latané, B., & Rodin, J. A lady in distress: Inhibiting effects of friends and strangers on bystander intervention. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1969, 5, 189-202.

Macauley, J., & Berkowitz, L. (Eds.) Altruism and helping behavior. New York: Academic Press, 1970.

McArthur, L. A. The how and what of why: Some determinants and consequences of causal attribution. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1972, 22, 171-193.

Miller, A. G. Social perception of internal-external control. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 1970, 30, 103-109.

Miller, A. G., Gillen, B., Schenker, C., & Radlove, S. Perception of obedience to authority. Proceedings of the 81st Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, 1973, 8, 127-128. (Summary)

Nisbett, R. E., & Borgida, E. Attribution and the psychology of prediction. Unpublished manuscript, University of Michigan, 1975.

Staub, E. Helping a distressed person: Social, personality, and stimulus determinants. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology, Vol. 7. New York: Academic Press, 1974.

Footnotes

[1]Parentheses indicate that separate sets of slides were used for those conditions in which confederates were present in the recreation of the altruism study.

[2]The pairs of bipolar adjectives were: dependent-independent, passive-active, weak-strong, warm-cold, intelligent-not intelligent, conforming-not conforming, likeable-unlikeable, easily influenced-hard to influence, and attractive-unattractive.

Table 1

Mean Personal Causality Attributed to the Target Person in the Altruism Experiment

	No Information		20% Helped		80% Helped		
Target Person[a]	Helped	Didn't Help	Helped	Didn't Help	Helped	Didn't Help	$\bar{X}$
Alone	49.75	72.00	47.75	61.20	51.25	60.00	56.99
With others who didn't help	62.20	29.50	56.75	33.50	53.00	48.25	47.20
With others who helped	34.50	47.25	38.40	52.05	47.25	55.00	45.74
$\bar{X}$	48.82	49.58	47.63	48.92	50.50	54.42	

Note. The higher the score the higher the percentage of personal causality attributed to the target person.

[a]The means for the male and female target persons are combined.

Table 2

Mean Estimates of the Generality of the Target Person's Behavior to a Real Life Situation

	No Information		20% Helped		80% Helped		
Target Person[a]	Helped	Didn't Help	Helped	Didn't Help	Helped	Didn't Help	$\bar{X}$
Alone	4.20	2.65	5.65	2.15	4.15	3.15	3.69
With others who didn't help	4.20	3.30	3.15	2.70	3.30	4.05	3.45
With others who helped	5.45	3.40	4.15	2.65	4.30	3.35	3.88
$\bar{X}$	4.62	3.12	4.32	2.50	3.92	3.52	

Note. The lower scores indicate increased estimates of generality.

[a]The means for the male and female target persons are combined.

Table 3

Mean Estimates of the Percentage of All Persons Who Would Help Under Similar Circumstances

Target Person[a]	No Information		20% Helped		80% Helped		$\bar{X}$
	Helped	Didn't Help	Helped	Didn't Help	Helped	Didn't Help	
Alone	81.50	59.00	36.00	37.50	81.00	75.00	61.67
With others who didn't help	80.00	62.50	52.50	40.00	80.00	69.50	64.08
With others who helped	65.00	50.50	51.00	43.50	79.50	70.50	60.00
$\bar{X}$	75.50	57.33	46.50	40.33	80.17	71.67	

Note. The higher the score the higher the percentage of all persons who would help.

[a]The means for the male and female target persons are combined.

Table 4

Summaries of Analyses of Variance for Subjects' Attributions of Causality, Estimates of Generality, and Base Rate Estimates

		Attributions of Causality		Estimates of Generality		Base Rate Estimates	
	df	MS	F	MS	F	MS	F
A (Altruism Condition)	2	4491.32	9.48***	5.64	<1	505.83	1.25
B (Target Person's Behavior)	1	356.01	<1	138.14	20.96***	10780.28	26.67***
C (Sex of Target Person)	1	82.18	<1	8.40	1.27	613.61	1.52
D (Base Rate Information)	2	579.45	1.22	6.55	<1	33509.97	82.91***
AB	2	11199.51	23.64***	26.29	3.99*	160.28	<1
AC	2	1143.52	2.41	2.04	<1	355.28	<1
AD	4	650.99	1.37	7.32	1.11	1615.82	4.00**
BC	1	993.34	2.10	.03	<1	62.50	<1
BD	2	85.62	<1	16.59	2.52	1214.46	3.00
CD	2	236.95	<1	5.97	<1	241.13	<1
ABC	2	663.74	1.40	5.49	<1	90.83	<1
ABD	4	1253.15	2.64*	5.49	<1	279.44	<1
ACD	4	576.19	1.22	7.03	1.07	82.75	<1

Table 4 (cont.)

	Attributions of Causality			Estimates of Generality		Base Rate Estimates	
	df	MS	F	MS	F	MS	F
BCD	2	571.92	1.21	.90	<1	609.91	1.51
ABCD	4	400.65	<1	7.91	1.20	1615.90	4.00**
S/ABCD	324	473.81		6.59		404.19	

*p < .05

**p < .01

***p < .001

Table 5

Univariate and Multivariate F Ratios for Subjects' Evaluative Impressions of the Target Person

Source of Variance	Dependent Independent F	Passive Active F	Weak Strong F	Warm Cold F	Intelligent Unintelligent F	Conforming Not Conforming F	Likeable Not Likeable F	Easily Influ. Not Easily In. F	Attractive Unattractive F	Multivariate F
A (Altruism Condition)	<1	6.97**	4.11*	2.28	<1	1.91	1.46	1.96	<1	1.92*
B (Target Person's Behavior)	14.54***	224.26***	39.56***	39.27***	9.02**	<1	19.59***	1.63	<1	26.09***
C (Sex of Target Person)	<1	1.89	6.41*	<1	2.21	2.56	8.17**	<1	24.89***	4.67***
D (Base Rate Information)	<1	<1	<1	3.38*	1.73	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1
AB	7.55***	1.74	1.55	2.28	<1	31.12***	1.38	16.67***	1.84	5.42***
AC	<1	3.72*	<1	<1	<1	<1	1.18	1.17	1.81	1.24
AD	1.23	<1	<1	<1	1.54	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1
BC	4.19*	<1	2.65	<1	1.32	1.11	<1	<1	1.70	1.62
BD	<1	<1	1.82	<1	1.42	1.17	<1	2.33	1.11	<1

Table 5 (cont.)

Source of Variance	Dependent Independent F	Passive Active F	Weak Strong F	Warm Cold F	Intelligent Unintelligent F	Conforming Not Conforming F	Likeable Not Likeable F	Easily Influ. Not Easily In. F	Attractive Unattractive F	Multivariate F
CD	<1	<1	1.69	<1	<1	<1	<1	2.25	1.63	<1
ABC	3.48*	<1	1.13	<1	1.15	1.77	1.76	1.71	3.09*	1.81*
ABD	<1	<1	<1	1.41	<1	<1	2.06	1.17	<1	<1
ACD	<1	<1	<1	<1	2.12	1.27	<1	1.17	<1	<1
BCD	1.53	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	1.54	<1	<1	<1
ABCD	<1	1.46	<1	2.15	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1

*$p < .05$

**$p < .01$

***$p < .001$